

FILED

FOR PUBLICATION

DEC 30 2009

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**KRISTIN M. PERRY; SANDRA B.
STIER; PAUL T. KATAMI; JEFFREY
J. ZARRILLO,**

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

and

**CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO,**

Plaintiff-intervenor,

v.

**ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in
his official capacity as Governor of
California; EDMUND G. BROWN, Jr.,
in his official capacity as Attorney
General of California; MARK B.
HORTON in his official capacity as
Director of the California Department
of Public Health & State Registrar of
Vital Statistics; LINETTE SCOTT, in
her official capacity as Deputy Director
of Health Information & Strategic
Planning for the California Department
of Public Health; PATRICK
O'CONNELL, in his official capacity as
Clerk-Recorder for the County of
Alameda; DEAN C. LOGAN, in his
official capacity as Registrar-**

No. 09-17241

D.C. No. 3:09-cv-02292-VRW

ORDER

**Recorder/County Clerk for the County
of Los Angeles,**

Defendants,

and

**DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH; GAIL
J. KNIGHT; MARTIN F.
GUTIERREZ; HAK-SHING
WILLIAM TAM; MARK A.
JANSSON;
PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM - YES
ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA
RENEWAL,**

Defendant-intervenors -
Appellants.

**KRISTIN M. PERRY; SANDRA B.
STIER; PAUL T. KATAMI; JEFFREY
J. ZARRILLO,**

Plaintiffs - Appellees,

and

**OUR FAMILY COALITION;
LAVENDER SENIORS OF THE EAST
BAY; PARENTS, FAMILIES, AND
FRIENDS OF LESBIANS AND GAYS,
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
FRANCISCO,**

Plaintiff-intervenors -

No. 09-17551

D.C. No. 3:09-cv-02292-VRW

Appellees,

v.

**ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER;
EDMUND G. BROWN, Jr.; MARK B.
HORTON; LINETTE SCOTT;
PATRICK O'CONNELL; DEAN C.
LOGAN,**

Defendants,

and

**DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH; GAIL
J. KNIGHT; MARTIN F.
GUTIERREZ; HAK-SHING
WILLIAM TAM; MARK A.
JANSSON;
PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM - YES
ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA
RENEWAL,**

Defendant-intervenors -
Appellants.

Before: THOMAS, Circuit Judge and En Banc Coordinator.

A judge of this court called for this case to be reheard en banc. A vote was taken, and a majority of the nonrecused active judges of the court did not vote in favor of en banc consideration. The call for rehearing en banc is DENIED. The case is returned to the three-judge panel.